

### REMARKS

In the February 26, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of the claims pending in the application (claims 1-21). Applicant declines to further amend the claims at this time. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hauser et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,734,700 (hereinafter "Hauser") in view of Azer, U.S. Pat. No. 5,481,592 (hereinafter "Azer"). Claims 1, 8, 15, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Houde et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,978,678 (hereinafter "Houde") in view of Azer. Applicant traverses these rejections.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine the references as proposed by the Examiner. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not satisfied all of the basic criteria set forth above.

The Examiner states that Azer discloses the use of temporary transfer-to numbers as recited in Applicant's claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Azer. A "temporary transfer-to telephone number" is defined in detail in the specification at page 6, lines 15-28. Briefly, among other attributes, "temporary transfer-to telephone numbers may be dynamically assigned to roaming subscriber units," and a temporary transfer-to number "is a call forwarding number that is used in an intermediate and temporary fashion between the subscriber telephone number and the call forwarding number associated with the subscriber unit." There are no such transfer-to numbers disclosed or suggested by Azer. Rather, the Azer system automatically changes the prefix region code and "redials" a call if the previous call attempt was not completed. In this regard, the Azer system performs an iterative "search" in an attempt to establish the call using the appropriate region code with the same ship identification number. Consequently, the proposed combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the recited claim limitations. Furthermore, the Examiner has not set forth any basis or evidence for a reasonable expectation of success in combining Hauser or Houde with Azer.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1-21 are not unpatentable over Hauser in view of Azer, or over Houde in view of Azer. Accordingly, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the §103 rejections of claims 1-21.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50/2258.

Respectfully submitted,



MARK M. TAKAHASHI  
Reg. No. 38,631

Date: *MAY 27, 2003*

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH  
4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100  
San Diego, CA 92121-2133

Telephone: (858) 638-6748 Fax: (858) 638-6727